



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Congress of Arts and Science, Universal Exposition, St. Louis, 1904. Edited by HOWARD J. ROGERS, A.M., LL.D., Director of Congresses. Volume II. *History of Politics and Economics, History of Law, History of Religion.* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1906. Pp. ix, 661.)

THIS second of the eight volumes which are to give us the remarkable series of papers read year before last by the scholars of the Old World and the New at the St. Louis Exposition covers three of the six "Departments" which made up what was known as the "Division" of "Historical Science". Doubtless the three remaining Departments of that Division—History of Language, History of Literature, and History of Art—will furnish the content of another volume.

At this late date it would be idle as well as invidious to question or to discuss the Congress's classification of human knowledge or its choice of the scholars who should represent the divisions thus created. Nor could it serve a useful purpose to recapitulate within the brief limits of a review the authors and the titles of the three dozen able addresses which compose the present volume. As everybody will remember, each Department, after listening with its fellow Departments to the opening paper of the Chairman of the Division, and after hearing two addresses of its own—one on the fundamental methods and conceptions of its branch of science, the other on its progress during the past century—was then to dissolve itself into "Sections", each of which should likewise listen to two papers, the first dealing with the relations of its sub-topic to neighboring fields, the second with its own present problems. Loyally carried out in the main, though with often a happy excursion and now and then a frank departure, the project in its literary incarnation lies now before us. What can be said of the result as a whole?

Already in his opening address Chairman Woodrow Wilson strikes a key-note. With admirable tact taking as his theme "The Variety and Unity of History", he finds place and mission for each of the great lines of study into which the Congress has divided "Historical Science"; but it is only to insist with a warmer emphasis on the essential oneness of the historian's field. The subject of History is not politics or economics or law or religion or literature or art or language. It is not all these combined. It is that of which these are but a few of the myriad changing phases. "All history has society as its subject-matter" (p. 8)—its theme is human life. From these opening thoughts of President Wilson to the final papers in the closing group—to Professor Har-

nack's underscored assertion (p. 622) that "The history of the church is part and parcel of universal history, and can be understood only in connection with it", and Professor Reville's jubilant affirmation (p. 645) that "The water-tight bulkhead which separated the so-called 'profane' from the so-called 'sacred' studies has been removed" and that "the progress of our general historical knowledge makes us recognize ever better that the history of Christianity . . . is intimately bound with the economical, moral, social, and religious history of the surrounding world"—this conviction of the oneness of History is the most recurrent note. As the programme of the Congress knows "science", but not "sciences", so its historians will have no divided history.

Most striking is this in that first body of speakers whom the logic of the programme has grouped under the rubric of "Political History". Their neighbors, however they protest their freedom, devote themselves to the field prescribed them; the political historians not only protest, they rebel. Not one of them restricts himself to the history of politics or seems to suppose himself expected to do so. Few of them even put political history foremost. One or two expressly remand it to the background. The apostasy is the more significant because it is clearly so unconscious. Who shall say that it is to be regretted?

All the groups, and not alone the opening speakers in each, are much concerned with questions of historical method. Yet, strange to say, that fundamental problem as to the logic of the historian's processes which is just now so exercising historians and logicians alike receives hardly a mention. Even Professor Colby's sparkling paper on "Historical Synthesis", though it touches it in passing, scarcely grasps its full import. Professor Lamprecht, whose own tenets are so hazarded, is of course not oblivious; but his attention is here mainly given to the positive exposition of his "socio-psychologic" theory—a theory of which, it is to be feared, he will find almost as little echo in the papers of his colleagues. Doubtless courtesy to such a guest contributed to this silence. Doubtless, too, many, like Professor Colby, "doubt whether academic utterances as to what history is or should be, help us very far forward" (p. 166). The unstudied implications of these thoughtful papers are, when they skirt the topics in dispute, of all the greater weight. Among the questions more largely ventilated is that as to the right of history to be an art as well as a science—or, as Professor Robinson, who makes this the chief topic of his paper on "The Conception and Methods of History", prefers to phrase it, the "relations between history and literature". Another old friend whose face peers out from many a paper is the issue, in its older form, between the narrator and the historical philosopher.

But perhaps the most gratifying quality of the volume as a whole is the sane and generous spirit with which even questions so hotly mooted as these are lifted out of the mire of altercation. It is, for example, precisely Professor Adams, who most keenly points out the besetting faults of the sociologist and the economist in their dealings with history,

who is most earnest in appeal to them for help, declaring (p. 137) that "without the work of the economic historian and the sociologist, the task of completing our scientific knowledge of medieval history" seems to him almost impossible.

To discuss the individual qualities of a series of studies so rich in variety and in personality is here impossible. There is in them little that suggests perfunctory work. All are suggestive, many are brilliant, a few seem notable contributions to knowledge or to thought. The briefer papers contributed to the sessions by those not officially speakers are here printed in abstract only. A somewhat unexpected but well-made and useful appendix to the several groups is a select bibliography of the literature of each subject.

GEORGE L. BURR.

Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship. By J. G. FRAZER.
(New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1905. Pp. xi, 309.)

SINCE the simultaneous appearance in 1861 of Maine's *Ancient Law* and Bachofen's *Mutterrecht* each year's research has revealed more and more clearly the relative culture-value of institutional history. Indeed, it is scarcely too much to say that the history of institutions is pure *Kulturgeschichte*. It is the essential element in sound sociological and anthropological investigation. The fact is gradually becoming familiar that all institutions are the slow resultant of human experience, the residuum of social struggle. As Frazer remarks (p. 3), even the great institutions of our civilized society, such as marriage, private property, and the worship of a god, "have their roots in savagery, and have been handed down to us . . . through countless generations, assuming new outward forms in the process of transmission, but remaining in their inmost core substantially unchanged". In particular the study of primitive magic promises to become a rich field for the discovery of institutional beginnings. Already this field has been partially explored by several English writers whose works show decided originality. Spencer and Gillen's detailed investigation of the sexual customs and other social conditions of the *Native Tribes of Central Australia* (1899) has been supplemented (1904) by their account of the *Northern Tribes* of the same region. In his *Mystic Rose* (1902) Crawley sought the origins of matrimonial institutions in the various usages arising in sexual taboo; while in 1900 Frazer's *Golden Bough*, an epoch-making study of magic and religion, reached the second edition.

The present work deals with the "sacred character and magical functions of kings in early society". It consists mainly of "fresh examples or illustrations of principles" (p. 2) already stated in the *Golden Bough*; and in substance it will appear in the third edition of that book now in press. The text is composed of nine lectures delivered at Trinity College, Cambridge, during 1905; and it is a very clear and entertaining discussion of a difficult subject, but supported in the numer-